

Riley County Vision 2025 Committee Meeting

September 20, 2007

7:30 – 9:30 p.m. Manhattan Headquarters Fire Station

Meeting Summary

Welcome & Review of Public Comments

Review of Previous Month Building Activity

- The meeting was called to order at 7:30pm by co-facilitator, Terrie McCants.
- The general public was acknowledged and asked to participate by writing comments/input on cards provided.
- Monty Wedel stated there were no comments submitted by the public at the last meeting.
- Monty Wedel reported the building activity for the month of August. There was only one building permit issued for a residence in a platted subdivision. He also added that there were no 20-acre splits reported by the County Cartographer.

Review Draft Future Land Use Map

- Monty Wedel reviewed the proposed future land use map agreed upon at the last meeting. He focused on the shaded areas surrounding the small cities and asked if the map should show the projected uses of the individual land use plans of each city or if a certain amount of area, based on discussions with each of the cities, should be shown as “Cooperative Planning Areas”. Following discussion, the Committee agreed that the latter option would be best but that the boundary should be determined in collaboration with the respective city.
- Wedel also reviewed the area around the potential new roads extending north-south from a straightened and extended Marlatt Avenue. Wedel explained that this area is currently displayed as a “Potential Long-Term Growth Area” and asked if this terminology and shaded areas was acceptable to the Committee. The Committee agreed by consensus that this was acceptable.

Discuss Working Definition of Rural Character

Suggested Definition: “The historical, cultural and physical features that define the rural landscape.”

- Terrie McCants and David Procter initiated discussion by reminding the Committee that the reasons for proposing a working definition of “rural character” were based on observations made by certain committee members that Ag areas/operations and rural character, albeit, share similar attributes, are different and should be evaluated separately. The suggestion was made last time to consider the Harvey County definition. This definition was offered for discussion.
- Following considerable discussion, the Committee agreed that rural character would be difficult to objectify and that preserving agricultural areas would also preserve the rural character of the County. The Committee consensus therefore was that a working definition of “rural character” is not necessary at this time in order to move on to the next topic.

Discussion of Density Goals for Ag Preservation & Rural Character

Question: What density of residential use should be our goal for:

- 1. Maintaining an area for primarily agricultural use?; and**
- 2. Maintaining rural character?**

- Monty Wedel initiated the exercise by showing and explaining the Residential Density map to the Committee. The Committee was already separated into three (3) small groups. The results of the exercise were as follows:

GROUP 1:

- ✓ The northern half (approx.) of the County should remain at one (1) residence per 80 acres (at least), with a higher level of criteria for development; the 20-acre exemption would not be permitted within this area;
- ✓ Tier the County based on density; the 20-acre exemption could be permitted in areas closer to Manhattan;
- ✓ Tailor density/development requirements per Township (boundaries are already established).

GROUP 2:

- ✓ Location of development is far more important than density;
- ✓ Certain areas could be made more attractive for development if they had central systems;
- ✓ All residential development proposals should go through the Planning Board for approval.

GROUP 3:

- ✓ The northern half (approx.) of the County should be remain at one (1) residence per 80 acres (at least);
- ✓ Tier the County based on density;
- ✓ Higher density on major (paved) routes such as Anderson, Tuttle Creek Boulevard, etc.;
- ✓ Southern portion of the County (Zeandale) should remain at one (1) residence per 80 acres (at least);
- ✓ Explore the Saline County approach (i.e., one 5-acre split with a conservation easement on remainder of tract).

Discussion of Priority Agricultural Areas for Preservation

Question: Based on our thoughts about appropriate density goals and considering current densities in the county:

- 1. Should we consider identifying priority areas for preservation within the "rural area"?; and**
- 2. If so, where would those priority areas be?**

- Monty Wedel initiated the exercise by showing and explaining the draft Future Land Use Map to the Committee. The three groups were instructed to use the various maps provided at their tables to complete the above task. The results of the exercise are as follows:

GROUP 1:

- ✓ Very difficult to define or identify areas for agricultural preservation; easier to identify areas for development;
- ✓ The focus should be on attributes/criteria for development approval and the goals, objectives & policies of the Plan.

GROUP 2:

- ✓ Same as Group 1.

GROUP 3:

- ✓ Criteria for development approval should be countywide, rather than trying to identify certain areas for preservation (allows more flexibility for landowners and development);
- ✓ Against the concept of a location map (no lines should be drawn on map).

- The Committee reached a consensus that the Future Land Use Map should not show predetermined areas for agricultural preservation. Instead a criteria based system for decision-making should be developed. It was agreed that staff would draft proposed criteria for consideration at the next meeting.

Next meeting: October 18, 2007, 7:30 PM at the Manhattan Fire Station Headquarters

Adjourned